DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 445 CE 011 608

AUTHOR	Thomas, Hollie B.; Carroll, Berlin R.
TITLE	Data-Based Locally Directed Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs. Final Report. July 1, 1976 to June 30, 1977.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. Program of Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee. Div. of Vocational Education.
BUREAU NO	C7-002
PUB DATE	Jul 77
NOTE	70p.; For related documents see CE 011 608-617
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	County School Systems; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Needs; Material Development; Post Secondary Education; *Program Evaluation; *School Districts; Secondary Education; *State Programs; Summative Evaluation; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida

ABSTRACT

As phase 1 of a Florida system for evaluation of secondary and postsecondary vocational education programs, a set of materials was developed to assist local education agencies (LEAs) in planning for and conducting locally directed evaluations. Objectives were to develop guidelines and procedures, instrumentation, strategies, materials, and activities for use by LEA personnel; to conduct field tests; and to revise the materials for dissemination by the state department. Based on the guidance of a steering/advisory committee with input from practitioners, the project staff reviewed and analyzed materials and procedures from other states and developed prototypes for eight components: (1) organizing for data-based locally directed evaluation, (2) comparison of program output with community occupational needs, (3) assessing student career interests, (4) facilities and equipment evaluation, (5) analysis of the utilization of community resources, (6) evaluation of occupational competencies, (7) evaluation of instructional personnel, and (8) assessment of local budget policy for support of vocational instructional programs. Each component was field-tested and materials revised for dissemination. Seven additional components are planned, based on the field test results. (Each of the eight components and an overview guide, CE 011 609, are available separately.) (JT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED147445

FINAL REPORT

PROJECT NO. C7-002

FROM JULY 1, 1976 to JUNE 30, 1977

DATA-BASED LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

PROGRAM OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32306

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hollie B. Thomas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

DR. HOLLIE B. THOMAS

MR. BERLIN R. CARROLL

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE PROJECT REPORTED HEREIN WAS CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO A GRANT FROM THE DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. CONTRACTORS UNDERTAKING SUCH PROJECTS ARE ENCOURAGED TO EXPRESS FREELY THEIR PROFESSIONAL JUDGEMENTS IN THE CONDUCT OF THE PROJECT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT, THEREFORE, NECESSARILY REPRESENT THE OFFICIAL POSITION OR POLICY OF THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

CE 011 608

DATA-BASED LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Project Director	Dr. Hollie B. Thomas
Coordinator	Mr. Berlin R. Carroll
Graduate Assistants	Ray Boyett Mary Haskins Ermine Owenby Bill Ozier Jerry Smith
Secretary	Mary Smith

Program of Vocational Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

In Cooperation with
the Florida State Department of Education
Division of Vocational Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

© State of Florida Department of State 1977

Authorization for reproduction is hereby granted to the State system of Public Education as defined in 228.041 (1), Florida Statutes. No authorization is granted for distribution or reproduction outside the State System of Public Instruction without prior approval in writing.

July 1977

Acknowledgements

On behalf of the program for Vocational Education at the Florida State University, I wish to express my appreciation to those who have made contributions to Florida's Data-Based Locally Directed Evaluation System. To the project staff--Berlin Carroll, Ray Boyett, Mary Haskins, Ermine Owenby, Bill Ozier, Jerry Smith, Mary Smith, and Bill Stancil, EPDA Fellow--who spent many arduous hours researching, writing, rewriting, editing, typing and retyping the various components, I extend my sincere appreciation and gratitude.

I also wish to express appreciation to the members of the DBLDE Steering Committee: Roy Giehls, Evaluation Section Director, DVE,DOE; John C. Davis, Sr., Industrial Education Coordinator, Lake City Community College; L. Warren Harrell, Program Implementation Section Director, DVE, DOE; William R. Jeffries, Program and Staff Development Section Director, DVE, DOE; Thomas L. Melvin, Director, Vocational Education, Jackson County; Jeanne Rehberg, Instructor, Cosmetology, Lake City Community College; and John Sojat, Planning, Programming and Budgeting Director, DVE, DOE.

I further extend my gratitude to the individuals who contributed through field reading and field testing activities; they are: Albert Caraway, Assistant Dean, Vocational-Technical Education, Chipola Junior College; John C. Davis, Sr., Industrial Education Coordinator, Lake City Community College; Steve Foland, Director, Vocational Education, Jefferson County; Robert Greener, Director, Vocational Education, Wakulla County; Fred Howell, Dean, Occupational Education, Chipola Junior College; William Kirby, Director, Vocational Education, Bay County; Bascom Mahaffey, Principal, Gadsden Vocational-Technical School; William McMillan, Supervisor, Vocational Education, Suwanee-Hamilton Area Vocational-Technical Center; Thomas L. Melvin, Director, Vocational Education, Jackson County; William Spear, Jr., Director, Vocational Education, Gadsden County; Lawrence Taylor, Vocational Principal, Dozier School for Boys; and Lewis Tucker, Director, Occupational and Adult Education, North Florida Junior College.

I am especially grateful to Roy Giehls whose foresight and support made this project possible. Without the combined efforts of all these persons, this evaluation system could not have become a reality.

Wollie B. Thomas
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

A. Need 2

B. Focus 2

II. Method 4

A. Steering/Advisory Committee Functions. 4

B. Project Staff Activities 5

C. Field Review/Field Reading 6

D. Field Test Activity. 8

III. Findings 9

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations. 11

V. Appendices 13

A. Master Sequence Chart for DBLDE Project. . . . 13

B. Q-Sort Instructions. 22

C. DBLDE Steering Committee Composition and Minutes. 30

D. Field Reading Committees, Sites, and Comments 42

E. Field Testing Comments 53

F. Letters. 64

I. Introduction

The Florida Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education has taken the initiative to design and to implement a comprehensive evaluation system to be accomplished no later than 1980. A fully implemented Florida model will consist of three levels of evaluation: (1) Data-Based Locally Directed Evaluation (DBLDE), (2) state-directed review of vocational education instructional programs, and (3) a state-conducted course or program audit. Each level has a specific or distinct function in the total evaluation process.

The first level, Data-Based Locally Directed Evaluation, is an evaluation to be conducted within the Local Education Agency (LEA) by individuals or teams selected from local administrators, staff, faculty, students, and citizens. The express purpose of DBLDE will be to determine how well local educational goals and objectives are being or have been met. Information from a Data-Based Locally Directed Evaluation, conscientiously collected and analyzed, will provide local education agencies with the summative evaluation information necessary for legitimate educational decision making. It will also provide the information necessary to respond adequately to questions generated by the state-directed review of vocational education instructional programs.

Need

Educational managers at all levels must make decisions concerning the expansion, modification, and improvement of vocational education programs. It is essential that these decisions be based on a systematic analysis of pertinent data. Well-executed locally directed evaluation, followed by statewide review of vocational programs, provides the data base from which realistic decisions can be made. The writers of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 recognized this fact and wrote sections into the law that mandated vocational education program evaluation. The writers of the 1976 Amendments continued this emphasis and called for a state-by-state evaluation on a continuing basis by the USOE. Thus, the facilitation of continuous evaluation at the local level provides the major thrust to meet these mandates.

Focus

Phase I of this project involved the development of eight components to assist local education agencies in planning for and conducting locally directed evaluations. The components suggest procedures and provide sample instrumentation from which local education agencies may develop evaluation techniques unique to their particular needs. Each component contains an overview which describes and defines the specific evaluation activity. These components also provide sections of suggested procedures

for use in conducting the evaluation, using the evaluation data, and analyzing discrepancies. Therefore, the specific objectives of Phase I were:

1. To develop guidelines and procedures for conducting locally directed evaluation of secondary and post-secondary vocational education programs;
2. To develop instrumentation, strategies, materials, and activities for use by local education agency personnel in the locally directed evaluation of vocational education programs;
3. To field test the materials and procedures developed for conducting a locally directed evaluation;
4. To revise the materials and procedures based on the input by the local education agencies as a result of their field reading/field testing of each component;
5. To deliver revised procedures to the Florida Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, for dissemination and to provide project staff assistance to local education agencies and the Department of Education staff as deemed appropriate;
6. To prepare a final report.

To facilitate meeting these objectives, a Master Sequence Chart (Appendix A) was prepared to be used as a systematic guide in the developmental process. The Master Sequence Chart was used to develop the eight components

that make up Phase I of the project.

II. Method

Steering/Advisory Committee Functions

During Phase I, a steering committee was formed to provide overall guidance and direction for the conduct of the project. Members focused their efforts on providing input for the design and implementation of the locally directed evaluation (LDE) system.

At the beginning of the developmental process, the steering committee participated in a Q-Sort activity which was used to establish the priority of the needed components to be developed and included in the LDE system. Each committee member was requested to judge each of several proposed components in terms of the extent of its preceived need in Florida's LDE effort. Following this judgement, the committee was then asked to establish a personal priority ranking of the components for the developmental process. This task was accomplished through the use of index cards upon which were listed the title of each individual component and the related Department of Education Vocational Education Instructional Program Review Standards. Each member was asked to number order the cards with the card receiving the highest priority being on the top and the one receiving the lowest priority on the bottom. The project staff then collected and tabulated the results of

the ranking. At the conclusion of this activity, a composite rank order was established for all the components, and the ranking was used to determine the priority of the components to be developed. See Appendix B for the details and composite rank order of the components.

Feedback from the practitioners in the local education agencies was sought at points in the developmental process:

1. To determine the types of evaluation materials and procedures to be developed;
2. To review (field read) the materials and procedures developed prior to the limited field test;
3. To provide input, based on a limited field test, regarding the utility of the materials developed.

See Appendix C for the committee membership, the dates and the agenda for the Steering Committee meetings.

Project Staff Activities

The project staff received input from the Steering Committee regarding the nature of the materials and procedures needed for the conduct of a locally directed evaluation.

During the initial stage of the project, the project staff reviewed and analyzed the materials and procedures used for evaluating vocational education programs which were developed by and are currently being used in other states. The staff identified those procedures and materials

that were applicable to Florida's evaluation needs. Additional materials and procedures were then developed to complete the prototype for eight components.

Field Review/Field Reading

Representatives from several local education agencies were asked to participate in the field reading of selected components prior to the limited field test of these components. This group of LEAs included representation from three junior colleges, five county directors of vocational education, one post-secondary area vocational-technical center, one secondary vocational-technical school, and one school under the jurisdiction of the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. The list of representatives and their review comments are included as Appendix D.

Members of the project staff met with members of the field reading group on an individual basis to discuss the overall goals of the project and to seek critical input regarding the content, format, language, and utility of the prorotype materials. Each participant was asked to review at least two selected components to insure maximum mix among the local education agencies.

Upon completion of the field reading, the LEA representatives provided valuable input needed to revise or rewrite portions of some components. Selected comments

follow:

1. "In dealing with a survey of community needs and student interests, you may also want to survey training capabilities of both the public and private sectors."
2. "I needed the component on Evaluation of Instructional Personnel last week. I made up my own evaluation forms. This component appears to be useful, easy to understand and could be implemented in its present form."
3. "In the component on Assessment of Local Budget Policy, I recommend including the funding formula, as this is needed to derive FTE's."
4. A general comment. "I recommend that the evaluation process be spread over a full year, looking at all aspects of the program. With this approach, teachers may tend to accept and perhaps even look forward to local evaluation."
5. 'May I suggest a field or pilot program for the evaluation project to get a better feel for its compatability with vocational centers."
6. "The document on Facilities and Equipment Evaluation seems well planned and the coverage appears to be very efficient."
7. "In the 'Foreword' under Evaluation of Instructional Personnel, I recommend changing the wording of the

sentence that suggests that all data gathered in the evaluation become the property of the instructor. This information should also be shared with the administration and the evaluation team."

Field Test Activity

The components were revised based on input provided by groups participating in the field reading. With the revisions incorporated, a limited field test of each component was conducted. The purpose of this activity was to insure that the prototype procedures were compatible with the activities in a variety of local education agencies. Consequently, a number of Florida educational institutions including community colleges, area vocational-technical centers, a secondary vocational-technical school, and one school under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health and Rehabilitive Services, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, were invited to participate in the activity. Final selection of field test sites was based on the willingness of the institution to participate, with some consideration given to proximity to the project headquarters. Another consideration in the selection of field test sites was prior participation in the field reading activity. To minimize biased input into the field test, participating institutions, with one exception, tested components other than those previously read during the field reading activity.

Materials, instruments, and check lists for conducting the field test were assembled and distributed to the test sites by a member of the project staff. At this time, a schedule was established and a target program was selected. Personnel from the test site who were to participate were also identified and responsibilities were assigned for conducting the field test. A typical evaluation team consisted of one or two members from the project staff, one member from the administration of the local institution, and one or two instructors from the program being evaluated.

On the scheduled date of the field test, the instrumentation and materials from the prototype components were used to collect the data for conducting the evaluation. At this time the instruments were reviewed for their utility and completeness. After collecting the data, the evaluation team analyzed and interpreted the information, conducted a discrepancy analysis, and prepared recommendations for revising the DBLDE procedures where needed. A list of field test sites, the components tested, and the comments concerning the field test activity are included as Appendix D.

III. Findings

Data-Based Locally Directed Evaluation of vocational education programs is not only desirable as a facilitator of change, but such an evaluation also provides information

necessary for legitimate educational decision making. A review of models used by other states to facilitate locally directed evaluation provided some assistance in meeting the needs of Florida. Consequently, this input was helpful in developing interim procedures for conducting locally directed evaluation and provided some guidelines for developing the components for Florida's DBLDE model.

As a result of the field reading/field testing activities, recommendations were gathered for additional revisions in the instrumentation and modification of the procedures to insure compatability with the needs of the local education agencies. The field reading/field testing procedures revealed minor deficiencies in the instrumentation and procedures contained within the components. These deficiencies noted are:

1. Student assessment forms for Evaluation of Instructional Personnel should be rewritten on the student's reading level.

2. Information more pertinent to community college funding should be provided in the component on the Assessment of Local Budget Policy. Computations for FTE students differ at the community college level.

3. An additional form would facilitate the reporting of results on career interest inventories to include categories or program areas, present and future enrollments, and areas in which discrepancies exist.

Phase I of the DBLDE system consists of components one through eight representing more than half of the fifteen components identified to be included in the total

DBLDE systems.

These components are:

1. Organizing for Data-Based Locally Directed Evaluation.
2. Comparison of Program Output with Community Occupational Needs.
3. Assessing Student Career Interests.
4. Facilities and Equipment Evaluation.
5. Analysis of the Utilization of Community Resources.
6. Evaluation of Occupational Competencies.
7. Evaluation of Instructional Personnel.
8. Assessment of Local Budget Policy for Support of Vocational Instructional Programs.

Each component has been written in simple language and kept brief. The first eight components representing Phase I are included as an attachment to this report. Seven additional components which were considered necessary for local education agencies to conduct a complete summative evaluation of their instructional programs need to be developed.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

Data-based locally directed evaluation was conceptualized as a system that the local education agencies could draw from to help them improve instruction through continuous evaluation of their vocational programs. Comments from personnel involved in the field reading and limited field testing of the prototype components indicate that DBLDE is a desirable and useful method of improving vocational

education in the State of Florida.

Based on comments from the field reading activity, the limited field test, and other feedback supporting the DBLDE concept (Appendix E), it is recommended that the following components be developed:

9. Assessment of Instructional Materials.
10. Evaluation through Employer Follow-Up.
11. Assessment of Student Services.
12. Evaluation through Student Follow-Up.
13. Evaluation of District Administrative Support.
14. Assessment of Services for Disadvantaged and Handicapped.
15. Cost/Outcome Analysis.

The development and documentation of these components will provide a valuable resource document to assist local education agencies in organizing and implementing a complete system of continuous evaluation of their vocational education programs.

APPENDIX A

MASTER SEQUENCE CHART

for

DATA-BASED LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATION PROJECT

1.0 Select Project Staff

- 1.1 Identify staff positions needed to complete project objectives
  - 1.1.1 Determine FTE for project staff positions
  - 1.1.2 Determine expertise needed
- 1.2 Develop job descriptions for staff positions
  - 1.2.1 Describe project coordinator's job
  - 1.2.2 Describe project secretary's job
  - 1.2.3 Describe project staff assistants' jobs
- 1.3 Establish search committee for project coordinator
  - 1.3.1 Name chairperson and committee members
  - 1.3.2 Review pertinent affirmative action procedures
- 1.4 Advertise position vacancies
  - 1.4.1 Prepare position vacancy announcements
  - 1.4.2 Locate applicant pool list and other possible applicants
  - 1.4.3 Review existing applicants in pool
  - 1.4.4 Process position vacancy announcements
- 1.5 Conduct search for position vacancies
  - 1.5.1 Accumulate position applications
  - 1.5.2 Establish applicant files
  - 1.5.3 Develop applicant evaluation procedures
  - 1.5.4 Call search committee meeting
  - 1.5.5 Review applicant files
  - 1.5.6 Conduct interviews as deemed necessary
  - 1.5.7 Rank order applicants based on best qualified
  - 1.5.8 Prepare findings
  - 1.5.9 Forward findings to appropriate channels for review and confirmation

APPENDIX A-2

1.6 Notify successful and unsuccessful applicants as determined by search committee

1.7 Process appointment papers for all selected project staff

2.0 Identify and name members of Advisory Committees

2.1 Identify and name members of Steering Committee

2.1.1 Identify appropriate State Education agencies
2.1.2 Identify prospective education agencies
2.1.3 Identify prospective vocational teachers
2.1.4 Determine project staff representative
2.1.5 Obtain personal commitment from selected persons to serve on the committee
2.1.6 Prepare formal invitation to those identified and named above
2.1.7 Notify each person of his selection and/or recycle to complete the committee membership

2.2 Identify and name members of Regional (local) Advisory Committee

2.2.1 Identify successful teachers from each of the vocational service areas
2.2.2 Identify local education agency administrators
2.2.3 Determine project staff
2.2.4 Obtain commitments to serve on committee
2.2.5 Notify members of their selection and obtain formal commitment or recycle to complete the committee membership

3.0 Assemble Locally Directed Evaluation (LDE) models and instrumentation from other states and local education agencies

3.1 Identify other states and local education agencies which have developed evaluation models

3.1.1 Research possible sources (e.g., consider Florida State Advisory Council for Vocational Education, ERIC system)
3.1.2 Assemble and catalog all materials already in house

APPENDIX A-3

3.2 Obtain suitable models for review

3.2.1 Order selected LDE models and materials
3.2.2 Follow-up on orders
3.2.3 File models for ease of access when received

4.0 Conduct Advisory Committee meetings

4.1 Establish date, place and time

4.1.1 Consider location for convenience and economy
4.1.2 Arrange for facilities

4.2 Prepare agenda

4.2.1 Identify topics to be discussed
4.2.2 Identify staff responsible for presenting topics
4.2.3 Solicit input from committee members

4.3 Advise members of meeting dates

4.3.1 Send memorandum of time, place, etc. (two weeks in advance of meetings)
4.3.2 Provide assistance in making necessary arrangements for travel and lodging

4.4 Prepare for meeting

4.4.1 Arrange for minutes to be recorded
4.4.2 Prepare multiple copies of all materials needed
4.4.3 Obtain and distribute materials to all members, including pads and pencils
4.4.4 Assemble necessary forms for reimbursement for travel

4.5 Conduct the meeting

4.5.1 Convene meeting and establish procedures to be used
4.5.2 Elect chairperson
4.5.3 Present materials as per agenda
4.5.4 Encourage input at identified points and on an informal basis
4.5.5 Assign individual responsibilities
4.5.6 Obtain necessary signatures on travel reimbursement requests

4.6 Provide members with feedback

4.6.1 Duplicate minutes
4.6.2 Remit minutes to each committee member within two weeks following the meeting

5.0 Analyze models and prepare prototype of Locally Directed Evaluation (LDE) model

5.1 Study various models for adaptation

5.1.1 Evaluate each part of available models with respect to Florida's needs
5.1.2 Identify models and/or parts of components which would serve the needs of Florida and could become a component of the Florida model

5.2 Prepare a prototype of Locally Directed Evaluation (LDE) model

5.2.1 Draft a model designed to meet the needs of Florida Schools
5.2.2 Develop necessary components for Florida LDE model where acceptable parts are not found in existing models
5.2.3 Complete the prototype
5.2.4 Review the prototype in consultation with Central Advisory Committee for the project
5.2.5 Revise the model based on Central Advisory Committee input

6.0 Assist state staff in formalizing vocational-technical program review procedures

6.1 Review existing procedures

6.1.1 Establish meeting schedule with State Staff
6.1.2 Meet with State Staff as per schedule (Name the Bureau)

6.2 Review existing instrumentation

6.2.1 Obtain copy of existing program review instrumentation
6.2.2 Review program, review instrumentation

6.3 Suggest appropriate additions or deletions to existing program review procedures and instrumentation

6.3.1 Prepare written recommendations
6.3.2 Forward recommendations to State Staff

6.4 Assist State Staff in conducting initial program review

6.5 Utilize feedback from review activities to update continuously vocational-technical program review procedures

7.0 Field test LDE procedures in local education agency sites

7.1 Develop techniques and procedures to conduct field tests

7.1.1 Prepare checklist of activities
7.1.2 Review checklist with project staff and State Staff
7.1.3 Review and print checklist for conducting field test

7.2 Assemble materials, instruments, etc., for field testing

7.2.1 Print all needed materials
7.2.2 Assemble materials in quantities for field test sites
7.2.3 Distribute materials to selected LDE test sites

7.3 Schedule time, date, and place for field testing

7.3.1 Coordinate time, date, and place with Department of Education, Evaluation Section
7.3.2 Coordinate with Department of Education, Regional Vocational Education offices
7.3.3 Coordinate LDE field test activities with local education agency

APPENDIX A-6

7.4 Conduct field test

- 7.4.1 Identify personnel involved
- 7.4.2 Assign responsibilities
- 7.4.3 Follow check list of activities

7.5 Develop instrument for feedback from Regional Advisory Committee

- 7.5.1 Prepare and distribute a check list relating to field test activities
- 7.5.2 Collect check lists
- 7.5.3 Compile data from check lists

7.6 Collect field test data

- 7.6.1 Schedule collection of data
- 7.6.2 Review instruments for incomplete data

7.7 Analyze field test data

- 7.7.1 Code data for analysis
- 7.7.2 Tabulate data
- 7.7.3 Interpret data as necessary
- 7.7.4 Prepare recommendations for revising LDE procedures

8.0 Revise LDE procedures

8.1 Utilize LDE feedback from Field Tests to make revisions in LDE procedures

- 8.1.1 Assemble evaluation of LDE procedures from LEA staff
- 8.1.2 Consult with Central and Regional Advisory Committees

8.2 Revise and print new prototypes

- 8.2.1 Revise prototype based on field test
- 8.2.2 Print revised prototype

9.0 Conduct second field test of LDE procedures

9.1 Select second field test sites; schedule time, date, and place for testing

9.1.1 Coordinate time, date, and place with Department of Education, Evaluation Section
9.1.2 Coordinate with Department of Education, Regional Vocational Education offices
9.1.3 Coordinate LDE field test activities with local education agency

9.2 Assemble materials, instruments, etc., for field testing

9.2.1 Print all needed materials
9.2.2 Assemble materials in quantities needed for field test
9.2.3 Distribute materials to selected LDE test sites

9.3 Conduct field test

9.3.1 Identify personnel involved
9.3.2 Assign responsibilities
9.3.3 Follow check list prepared for conducting field test

9.4 Collect field test data

9.4.1 Schedule collection of data
9.4.2 Review instruments for incomplete data

9.5 Analyze field test data

9.5.1 Code data for analysis
9.5.2 Tabulate data
9.5.3 Interpret data as necessary
9.5.4 Prepare recommendations for revising LDE procedures

10.0 Formalize, print, and disseminate LDE procedures handbook and instructions

10.1 Prepare final draft

10.1.1 Analyze feedback from field tests
10.1.2 Analyze suggestions from Central and Regional Advisory Committees and/or Department of Education, Evaluation Section
10.1.3 Write final draft based on synthesis of feedback

10.2 Prepare instructions for conducting LDE

10.2.1 Analyze feedback from field test participants
10.2.2 Revise instructions on basis of feedback

10.3 Select format for handbook

10.4 Print LDE handbook

10.5 Disseminate

10.5.1 Consult with Divison of Vocational Education, Dissemination Section concerning method of dissemination
10.5.2 Send copy to each Central Advisory Committee member
10.5.3 Send copies to appropriate Division of Vocational Education Bureaus
10.5.4 Distribute copies of LDE procedures as per dissemination plan

11.0 Develop supportive strategies for education target audience about LDE

11.1 Develop strategies for discussing the benefits of LDE

11.1.1 Identify appropriate meetings to present LDE, e.g., Florida Association of School Superintendents and Florida Chapter of National Council of Local Administrators (including the local directors of Vocational Education)
11.1.2 Develop presentation to be made to identified groups

11.2 Make presentation as scheduled

12.0 Assist local education agencies in conducting LDE

12.1 Advise local education agencies of availability of assistance by project staff
12.2 Provide assistance when requested

13.0 Prepare and submit final report

APPENDIX A-9

13.1 Prepare report

- 13.1.1 Develop outline for final report
- 13.1.2 Write summary of outcome as each activity is completed
- 13.1.3 Prepare sub-sections as project progresses
- 13.1.4 Retain copies of pertinent activities in a notebook for Appendices
- 13.1.5 Finalize and print final report in quantities needed

13.2 Submit final report to appropriate Division of Vocational Education staff

APPENDIX B

Q-SORT INSTRUCTIONS

Introduction

The Department of Education (DOE) has developed two instruments which contain standards for the review of vocational education programs. These are to be used in the state conducted review of vocational education programs. One instrument is used for reviewing occupational proficiency programs. The second is used for reviewing pre-vocational and pre-technical programs. There are numerous standards contained in each instrument which cannot be answered with a simple "yes" or "no." Actually, considerable data must be collected, tabulated, and analyzed by appropriate individuals or groups of individuals from the local area to provide the information base from which to make sound evaluative judgment.

For example, Standard One for the Occupational Proficiency Programs instrument states, "The occupational proficiency programs is based on (a) identified current and projected occupational opportunities, and (b) student interest and need." It is essential that personnel participating in the local evaluation process have available the results of student interest and needs surveys and local occupational surveys from which to base their judgments as to the adequacy of the program.

In addition to the standards used in the state conducted review of vocational education programs, components of a Locally Directed Evaluation (LDE) effort are being identified and related to the above standards. It is essential that the standards and LDE components be correlated so that priorities may be set in the development of procedures and instrumentation for the components of an LDE system for Florida.

The purpose of this Q-Sort activity is to provide information regarding the components to be included in the LDE system. From this activity we will establish the priority for the development of the procedures and related instrumentation for the components of Florida's LDE system.

Procedures

As a steering committee member, you are requested (1) to judge each component in terms of the extent to which that

particular component is necessary in Florida's LDE effort, and then (2) to establish your priority for the development of each component's procedures and related instrumentation.

Attachment A lists several proposed components of Florida's LDE effort and the scope of these components.

Attachment B, the index cards, lists the title of each individual component with its related DOE Standards. A sample is given below.

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT CAREER INTEREST

A. STANDARDS ADDRESSED:

Pre-Voc/Tech Programs: 1,10,11

Occupational Proficiency: 1,13,14

B. PRIORITY:_____

C. COMMENT:

Attachment C, is the DOE Standard for Review of (1) Occupational Proficiency Programs and (2) Pre-Vocational and Pre-Technical Programs. (These are available from the Regional Division of Vocational Education offices.)

We are asking that each steering committee member order the index cards with the component receiving the highest priority on top, and the one receiving the lowest priority on bottom. After ranking the cards in order of priority, the committee member may write the order of priority on each card in the space provided, i.e., top card, Priority 1, second card, Priority 2; and so on or turn in the packet to be tallied by a project staff member. The project staff will tabulate the results of the ranking.

APPENDIX B-3 Attachment A

DESCRIPTIONS OF LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATION COMPONENTS

Student Follow-Up Survey

The component "Student Follow-up Survey" is designed to collect data for use (along with other data) in decisions regarding nearly every aspect of the program. Student follow-up information is extremely valuable in determining the extent to which the program has met its ultimate objectives of preparing students for a place in society. The student follow-up survey generally will require questionnaires or rating scales. Adaptation to the pecularities of the LEA and, perhaps, specific programs and courses is essential.

Employer Follow-up Survey

The component "Employer Follow-up Survey" can provide information about how graduates perform on the job, how well the LEA's programs have prepared students for employment and how the program can be improved. Ultimately, by utilizing the results of this activity the LEA will be able to improve its programs in occupational education. The "Employer Follow-up" involves obtaining comments and ratings from employers regarding the performance of former students. This survey can be designed to incorporate the use of a mailed instrument, a telephone interview, or a personal interview.

Student Evaluation of Instruction

"Student Evaluation of Instruction" is designed to aid the staff in obtaining information from current students to facilitate the improvement of classroom instruction. A locally developed questionnaire or rating scale is frequently administered to currently enrolled students. Data obtained in this manner is used in making decisions regarding program, course, and lesson planning; provision for individual differences; student motivation; teacher command of subject matter; teaching techniques; and classroom/laboratory/work station operation and control.

Assessment of Student Services

The component "Assessment of Student Services" focuses on the evaluation of a broad array of services offered to students. For example, questionnaires and/or interviews can be used to gather perceptions and reactions from current

students, former students, LEA staff, employers, and parents regarding career counseling, the placement program, youth organizations, etc. It is designed to assist the LEA in determining if it is meeting the needs, interests and abilities of its students as they relate to these services. Other areas often categorized with student services such as student follow-up, identification of disadvantaged and handicapped, surveying student interest and assessing the availability and use of career information are focused on other activities associated with this series.

Assessment of Student Career Interest

This component is designed to assist in surveying, analyzing, reporting, and most importantly, utilizing student career interest information. The use of interest information is emphasized in two ways: (1) To aid in student career planning; and (2) to aid in curriculum program planning. Utilization of standardized interest inventories may facilitate the collection and use of student career interest information and may help formalize the evaluation process.

Assessment of Instruction and Instructional Materials

Instructional materials are tools or aids that facilitate the instruction/learning process. They include both print and nonprint products such as textbooks, films, laboratory manuals, transparencies, filmstrips and other materials used in the instructional process. This component is designed to aid in the collection and use of instructional materials. It consists of: (1) the inventory of all instructional materials that are owned by the LEA; (2) an assessment of the adequacy of each of the materials; and (3) the utilization of results of phases one and two to increase the use of materials and also aid in the selection of new materials.

Evaluation of Facilities

Evaluation of Facilities is designed to help in analyzing existing facilities for the purpose of determining future needs for expansion, renovation or abandonment. Typically, facilities evaluation occurs in two distinct stages or at two points in time. First, the need for facilities is determined by careful evaluation of manpower needs, program design, population surveys, and so on. This first phase is done prior to the writing of educational specifications and the employment of an architect for a new facility. The second phase of evaluation occurs after a facility has been

used and it has witnessed changes in curriculum, student population, and other program related characteristics. This second phase often requires a re-analysis of employment, student, and curricular needs but often, emphasis is placed upon determining the adequacy of existing facilities. Both phases involve the inventory, observation, and rating of facility characteristics by both advisory committee members and staff members.

Internal/External Team Review

Internal/External Team Review is designed to (a) collect information from various sources and (b) provide recommendations and suggested solutions for improving individual programs, courses, selected program components (areas of concern) or the total program. Internal/External Team Review uses two groups: (1) a planning committee to organize the evaluation and (2) a review team of internal and external personnel to help evaluate programs. The planning committee is made up of LEA personnel. Internal personnel are represented by teachers, administrators, counselors and students. External personnel include educators from other institutions; business, industry and government representatives; advisory committee members and former students.

Analyses of Community Resources

Determination of the availability and effectiveness of resources such as advisory committees, speakers, field trips, etc., is the primary purpose of this component. Activities focus on the identification of available resources through the use of a mail questionnaire or telephone survey and on the rating of these resources by students and staff through the use of a printed questionnaire or rating scale. Effective utilization of the many resources available in your community promotes and enhances cooperation between students, parents, teachers, administrators, businessmen, organized labor, and laymen which in turn results in more meaningful and effective occupational programs serving the same groups of people.

Identification of Community Occupational Needs

Local business-industry surveys provide information re: current local employment needs, new and expanding industry, and projected employment needs in two to five years. Also this information may reflect the decline in certain

occupational careers, such as tanners, blacksmiths, etc.

Utilization of Placement and Follow-up Data

Placement data would indicate the extent to which graduates or completers of an occupational program were successfully placed on the job in the specific occupational area or a related area. This information would relate to the student/employer follow-up data in the training of persons to fill local employment needs.

Evaluation of District Educational Administrative Support

This component will be designed to answer questions regarding administrative support for: inservice activites, professional development activites, supervisory functions, financial assistance for travel and for facilities, equipment and consumables.

Evaluation of the Career Information Program

The activities involved in this component are intended to assist local education agencies in evaluating their programs of career information. The career information program is a system for providing career related materials about self, occupations and educational alternatives to students at the elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels. It focuses on information programs at the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels. The activities should be applied to the total LEA including the holdings of the library and media center. Career information efforts of instructors should be included in the assessment also.

Personnel Evaluation and Development

Most educational institutions incorporate some type of instructor evaluation procedure as a part of their educational program. In some cases this evaluation procedure has been developed to foster growth and development of personnel. Usually, the evaluation of instructional personnel has been fragmented, frightening and frustrating for both administrators and instructors. There are few LEAs that don't have personnel evaluation procedures specified in contracts between the control board and its employees. The activities involved with this component suggest a method for developing new or revising current instructional staff evaluation practices within the LEA. They also address staff development through inservice

programs, attendance at workshops, professional meetings, and staff involvement in other developmental activities.

Identification of Student Occupational Competencies

Identification of occupational competencies is an essential component of an effective evaluation system. Occupational program planners continually feel the impact of changes that affect the attitudes, knowledges, and skills necessary for job entrance and continued employment. Program excellence can be achieved only when students are prepared with necessary tools for employment. The identification of and standards for measuring Student Occupational Competencies are established by the instructor and the related occupational advisory committee, with added input from DOE personnel and industry and business specialists.

Assessment of Services for the Disadvantaged and Handicapped

The activities of this component are designed to improve services to students with special needs. Phase one involves the identification and specification of the special needs of current and potential students and a comparison of needs to available services. A second phase involves determining the adequacy of services through the gathering of information from current and former students, staff, parents, and community representatives.

Assessment of Student Occupational Competence

The activity related to the Assessment of Student Occupational Competence is designed to help instructors improve and expand techniques for assessing student occupational competence. The increased utilization of results of student occupational competence by instructors, administrators, employers, and students is stressed.

Cost/Outcome Analysis

Cost/Outcome Analysis is a method of relating returns both monetary and non-monetary to investments for the purpose of improving program planning and decision making. The term "benefits" connotes both educational performance and dollar outcomes. Both outcomes and costs are focused on in this activity. Cost/Outcome Analysis may include administration, attendance, health services, pupil transportation, or it might focus entirely on instructional programs, courses or lessons.

APPENDIX B-8

COMPOSITE OF SELECTED COMPONENTS OF LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATION

LDE Component/Activity	Rank Order		
	Steering Committee	Staff	Combined Steering Committee/Staff
Student Follow-up Survey	10	17	16
Employer Follow-Up Survey	8	18	12
Student Evaluation of Instruction	12	5	11
Assessment of Student Services	15.5	6	13
Assessment of Student Career Interest	2	2.5	2
Assessment of Instruction and Instructional Materials	5	16	9
Facilities and Equipment Evaluation	4	4	3
Internal/External Team Review	19	19	20
Evaluation of the Career Information Program	17	8	14
Personnel Evaluation and Development	9	7	6
Identification of Occupational Competencies	3	15	5
Assessment of Services for the Disadvantaged and Handicapped	13.5	18	18
Assessment of Student Occupational Competencies	6	12.5	8
Cost/Outcome Analysis	18	12.5	19
Analyses of Community Resources	11	1	4
Identification of Community Occupational Needs	1	2.5	1
Utilization of Placement and Follow-up Data	13.5	10.5	15
Evaluation of District Administrative Support	15.5	10.5	17
Local Budget Policy for Support of Vocational Instructional Programs	7	9	7

APPENDIX C

DBLDE STEERING COMMITTEE

Chairman:

Dr. Roy Giehls	DOE, DVE-Evaluation Section Director

Members:

Mr. Berlin R. Carroll	FSU, Project Coordinator
Dr. John C. Davis, Sr.	Lake City Community College, Industrial Coordinator
Mr. L. Warren Harrell	DOE, DVE-Program Implementation Section Director
Mr. William R. Jeffries	DOE, DVE-Program and Staff Development Section Director
Mr. Thomas L. Melvin	Jackson County, Director of Vocational Education
Mrs. Jeanne Rehberg	Lake City Community College, Instructor, Cosmetology
Mr. John Sojat	DOE,DVE-Planning, Programming and Budgeting Director
Dr. Hollie B. Thomas	FSU, Project Director

Secretary:

Ms. Ermine M. Owenby	FSU, Project Staff

APPENDIX C-2

LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Steering Committee Meeting

Tallahassee, FL

October 6, 1976

Agenda

10:00-10:15	Introductions	Dr. Hollie B. Thomas
10:15-10:30	Election of Chairperson	Dr. Hollie B. Thomas
10:30-10:50	Overview of Statewide Vocational Education Program Review	Dr. Roy Giehls
10:50-11:10	Overview of Locally Directed Evaluation	Dr. Hollie B. Thomas
11:10-12:00	Review of Selected LDE materials	Mr. Ray Boyett
12:00- 1:30	Lunch	
1:30- 2:00	Discussion: Components of Locally Directed Evaluation	Committee Members
2:00- 3:00	Discussion: Establish priorities for developing components of Locally Directed Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs for Florida	
3:00- 3:15	Break	
3:15- 3:45	Discussion: Regional Advisory Committee membership and possible sites for first field tests	
3:45	Set date, time, and location of next meeting.	
	Adjourn	

APPENDIX C-3

LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting

Members Present:

Dr. John C. Davis, Sr., Coordinator of Technical (Industrial) Programs, Lake City Community College, Lake City
Mr. Thomas L. Melvin, Director of Vocational Education, Jackson County Schools, Marianna
Mrs. Jeanne Rehberg, Director of Cosmetology, Lake City Community College, Lake City
Dr. Roy Giehls, DOE, DVE-Evaluation Section Director
Mr. W. R. Jeffries, DOE, DVE-Program and Staff Development Section Director
Mr. John R. Sojat, DOE, DVE-Planning, Programming and Budgeting Director
Dr. Hollie B. Thomas, FSU, Project Director
Mr. Berlin R. Carroll, FSU, Project Coordinator
Mr. Ray Boyett, FSU, Project Staff
Ms. Ermine M. Owenby, FSU, Project Staff

Members Absent:

Mr. L. Warren Harrell

The Steering Committee met Wednesday, October 6, 1976, in the Conference Room (426) of the Collins Building Annex, Tallahassee.

The opening remarks were given by Dr. Thomas. In his comments he addressed the purpose of the steering committee, that of giving advice to the project staff regarding this project which was funded by the Bureau of Research, Dissemination/Diffusion, and Evaluation.

Introductions were made with each individual present giving his name, present position, and location.

Mr. Melvin nominated Dr. Giehls to serve as the Chairperson for the Steering Committee's activities. Mr. Sojat seconded the nomination. Mr. Jeffries offered that we accept the nomination with unanimous approval.

Dr. Giehls gave an overview of the Statewide Vocational Education Program Review. He stated that the DOE was directed to define and described components for evaluating vocational education programs in Florida. These components

are designed to assist the state in developing and operating quality, efficient and effective vocational education programs. This system of statewide evaluation is to be implemented by the Fall of 1976 in some 1,960 school programs across the state. Implementation of this statewide evaluation procedure is strictly on a voluntary basis at the junior college level. It is aimed primarily at the local school districts and is to begin about November 1, 1976.

Dr. Thomas gave an overview of locally directed evaluation, evaluation terminology, definitions, and suggested components for locally directed evaluation.

Mr. Boyett presented a review of selected locally directed evaluation materials which have been collected by the project staff. These were made available for review during and following lunch.

(a) Byran Study (Michigan)
(b) Wentling Materials (Illinois)
(c) Team leadership handbook (Illinois)
(d) National Pilot Test Instruments and Procedures of Vocational/Technical Education Institutions and Programs (AVA)
(e) System for Analyzing the Cost of Operation, Vocational Education Programs (Ohio)
(f) Student Follow-up and Needs Assessment (New Hampshire)
(g) Exemplary Competency Based Vocational Teacher Education Project, Consultative and Administrative Support Component (Florida)
(h) LDE of Career Education (Wentling)
(i) Evaluative instruments for Local Industrial Programs (Gallington)
(j) Ohio Pride Materials
(k) Guidelines for Student Placement and Follow-up (Florida)
(l) Packet of materials from local directors and community college deans

The filmstrip and tape of "Introduction to Locally Directed Evaluation" developed by Dr. Tim Wentling, Illinois, was presented to the entire group for their reaction.

Following lunch the suggested components for locally directed evaluation were presented to the committee. A leaflet consisting of the title of the components and the purpose of each component and the corresponding standards

included in the Statewide Evaluation instrumentation was distributed.

In the discussion regarding the suggested components, Dr. Davis suggested a new component, "Budget Policy for the Support of Vocational Instruction," (namely, consumable supplies). Dr. Giehls expressed the idea that "Internal/ External Review" is a method rather than a variable to be considered at this time.

A Q-Sort activity prepared for each committee member was used to establish a priority of each of the components to be developed by the project staff. The priority among the committee members and project members was prepared. A copy of the priority assigned to LDE components is attached.

In projecting for the first field test, three possibilities were suggested. Bay County has an area vocational-technical center and a community college; Okaloosa County has a community college with an area center; and the PAEC counties have several vocational programs. A final decision will not be made until each possibility for each situation is studied further.

It was suggested that the next meeting not be held in December due to the AVA Convention, and Christmas vacation being so early at the university where the project staff is housed. It was agreed that the next meeting should be scheduled for the third week in January, 1977.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm.

APPENDIX C-6

College of Education
Vocational Education
202 South Woodward

The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

TO: Harrell, Melvin, Davis, Rehberg, Jeffries, Sojat and Giehls

FROM: Berlin R. Carroll, DBLDE Project Coordinator

RE: Steering Committee Meeting

DATE: April 11, 1977

The Steering Committee for the Data-Based Locally Directed Evaluation project will meet at 10 AM, April 21, 1977. The meeting will be held in Room 430, Collins Building, Tallahassee FL.

The purpose of the meeting is to:

1. Review prototype DBLDE components,

2. Discuss the feasibility of a limited field test, and

3. Discuss Phase II.

A copy of the proposed agenda is enclosed for your perusal. Should you wish to include other topics on the agenda, please contact me no later than Monday, April 18.

/jks

enclosure

APPENDIX C-7

DBLDE Steering Committee Meeting

Tallahassee, FL

April 21, 1977

10:00 AM - 3:00 PM

1.	Introductory remarks	Dr. Roy Giehls
2.	Overview of DBLDE activities	Dr. Hollie B. Thomas
3.	Review of Prototype DBLDE components	Mr. Berlin R. Carroll
4.	Slide presentation and discussion of public relations brochure	Mr. Ray Boyett
5.	Break for lunch	
6.	Discussion of field reading activities	Moderator: Mr. William Stancil Group Discussion
7.	Discussion of limited field test	Moderator: Dr. Hollie B. Thomas
8.	Discussion of Phase II	Co-Moderators: Dr. Hollie B.Thomas Dr. Roy Giehls
9.	Summary and closing remarks	Dr. Roy Giehls

APPENDIX C-8

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWING COMPONENTS

The following questions are provided to assist you in reviewing the attached components of Florida's Data-Based Locally Directed Evaluation System.

You may write your comments on the document or on a separate sheet of paper. If you write your comments on a separate sheet, it would be of great assistance if you would note the page and line(s) to which your comments are directed.

1. Is the content of the component easy to understand?

2. Does the overview of the component provide you with sufficient information on the topic? If you feel that additions or deletions should be made, please make specific recommendations.

3. Are there words or terms that need further explanation? Should a glossary be included in each component, or should a glossary for the entire package (of the 15 components) be provided with the introduction and overview of the entire system.

4. Are the suggested procedures contained in each component complete? Do they provide sufficient guidance for your institution to conduct the evaluation?

5. Are the sample instruments adequate? Can you adapt these to your local education setting? Are these usable in their current form? Do you have any additional instruments which you might provide us that could be added to the Appendixes?

NOTE: Please read the introductory materials before reviewing the enclosed component(s) of the data-based evaluation system.

APPENDIX C-9

DATA-BASED LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATION

Minutes of Steering Committee Meeting

Members Present:

Dr. Roy Giehls, Dr. Hollie B. Thomas, Dr. John C. Davis, Mr. Berlin Carroll, Mr. Ray Boyett, Mr. Thomas Melvin, Ms. Ermine M. Owenby, Mrs. Jeanne Rehberg, and Mr. L. Warren Harrell (late arrival).

Members Absent:

Mr. John Sojat and Mr. W. R. Jeffries.

The Steering Committee met Thursday, April 21, 1977, in the Conference Room (430) of the Collins Building Annex, Tallahassee.

Dr. Roy Giehls introduced guests Mrs. Mary Haskins and Mr. William Stancil, EPDA Fellow. Both are graduate students at FSU and are working on the project.

Mrs. Christine Sharron was introduced as a member of the Evaluation Section staff and her assignment is to monitor the DBLDE project. An earlier meeting with project staff members at FSU and her observations and recommendations regarding the development of the components were discussed. Dr. David McQuet, Research Section staff, is also assigned to review the "paper work" on the project.

Dr. Giehls also expressed his apology for the absence of the two state department members of the steering committee.

Dr. Hollie B. Thomas gave a brief progress report on the project's staff activities since the last meeting. The prototype components which have been completed were presented. A number of the original component titles did not accurately reflect present developmental activities, therefore, several components have either been renamed or combined. It was noted that the prototype components had been reviewed by community college personnel, area vocational center personnel, several county directors, and the vocational principal at Dozier School for Boys.

Mr. Berlin Carroll, Project Coordinator, reviewed the outline of the five sections of each component. Specific comments on the format were asked for. Dr. Davis commented

that the format was easy to follow. However, for easier understanding, a glossary is needed on the funding formula in Component 8 on Budget Policy. Jeanne Rehberg commented on the value of Ray Boyett's presentation at Lake City prior to their teachers' reviewing the components. She stated that his presentation provided the teachers the insight they needed before they began their review.

Dr. Thomas asked for new component topics. One topic has emerged from general conversations: Determination of the cost category for each vocational program. It seems that teachers are not aware of the cost category of funding in which some of their courses are placed. Perhaps a criteria should be developed for arriving at the formula to put courses into cost categories.

Dr. Thomas also pointed out that the Breakout of the Tasks was used to write each component. Those present agreed that the Breakout should remain in the Summary section rather than be placed at the beginning of the component or in the Appendixes.

Ray Boyett made a presentation on the contents of the public relations brochure. He stated that the transparencies which he presented have been revised since the last steering committee meeting. Also, he pointed out that the title has been revised and "Data-Based" has been added. Of the original 19 suggested components, there are now 15. Several have been merged together. He asked if those present thought that this transparency presentation would be a suitable public relations technique which could be used at a later date. The group agreed.

A number of questions were asked with regard to the use of specific words or phrases. Dr. Giehls stated that the Federal Legislation also speaks to the State Standards which are given in each component. What does "local district" imply? K-12 only? Should "Local Education Agency" be used in Item 2 in What is DBLDE? This change would also be made in Item 2 under Legislative Mandate.

Dr. John Davis recommended that the Junior College Division of the DOE be apprised of the project and there be more involvement from them.

The committee adjourned for lunch at 11:45 AM and reconvened at 1:00 PM.

Dr. Giehls introduced Mrs. Patsy Agee, Bureau Chief, Research, Dissemination/Diffusion, and Evaluation. She joined the meeting following lunch. Mr. Warren Harrell also joined the meeting following the lunch break.

Discussion of the field readings. Mr. William Stancil provided a review of the field reading activities conducted by several counties. The reviews were favorable. Some suggestions were offered to the project staff for improving the content of the various components and some of the sample instruments. The participating counties which have returned their reviews are Wakulla, Jefferson, Gadsden, Jackson, and Bay, as well as Lake City Community College and Dozier School for Boys. The materials had not been returned by Chipola Junior College and Suwanee-Hamilton Area Vocational Center in time for this meeting.

Discussion of the field tests. Dr. Hollie Thomas discussed plans for a limited field test of the various DBLDE components. He stated that selected local education agencies would walk through one or two components. There has been one limited field test completed at Dozier School for Boys in Marianna. There are four others scheduled at Jackson County, Madison County, Gadsden County, and Lake City Community College. A fifth possibility is Jefferson County. The value of the limited field test is to provide feedback to the project staff from which steps of procedure can be established when organizing a local evaluation. Feedback from the field tests will also be used to identify necessary revisions to the various DBLDE components.

Mr. Ray Boyett reviewed the process of the evaluation conducted at Dozier. He reported no difficulty in going through the evaluation process. However, they found that a few of the questions addressed in the instruments should be shifted to other areas.

The question was asked whether or not the standards addressed in each component should be deleted from the evaluation package. If these standards and their numbers are to be removed, how will the staff and future users address the content of the components with regard to the standards? A discussion followed. Part of the rationale given is that the standards may be changed from year to year. However, as the programs are being reviewed, each local education agency will be provided with the standards to be applied in the review. The consensus was that the

standards should be excluded from the DBLDE components.

Discussion of Phase II. Dr. Giehls and Dr. Thomas discussed the second phase of this project. Dr. Thomas stated that he felt that by the end of this fiscal year eight of the components could be delivered in final form. During Phase II, the remaining components are to be developed. Intensive field testing of the entire DBLDE system will also be conducted during Phase II.

Dr. Giehls also stated that the proposal for Phase II had been submitted, but that the State Plan was not completed at this time, and therefore, the proposal had not been approved.

Recommendation. Dr. Giehls recommended that the project staff meet with Dr. Myron Blee of the Community College Division and apprise them of the work on this project.

No date was set for the next meeting. The meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

APPENDIX D

FIELD READING COMMITTEES AND SITES

Names and Positions:	Sites:
Albert Caraway Assistant Dean, Vocational-Technical Education	Chipola Junior College
Dr. John C. Davis, Sr. Coordinator, Technical Education	Lake City Community College
Steve Foland Director, Vocational Education	Jefferson County
Robert Greener Director, Vocational Education	Wakulla County
Fred Howell Dean, Occupational Education	Chipola Junior College
William Kirby Director, Vocational Education	Bay County
Bascom Mahaffey Principal	Gadsden Vocational-Technical School
William McMillan Supervisor, Vocational Education	Suwanee-Hamilton Area Vocational-Technical Center
Thomas L. Melvin Director, Vocational Education	Jackson County
William Spear, Jr. Director, Vocational Education	Gadsden County
Lawrence Taylor Vocational Principal	Dozier School for Boys
Lewis Tucker Director, Occupational and Adult Education	North Florida Junior College

APPENDIX D-2

FIELD READING COMMENTS

Reviewed by: James Fuqua, Coordinator, Vocational-Technical and Adult Education
William Kirby, Director, Vocational-Technical and Adult Education

Reviewing Institution: Bay County, Panama City

Date of Review: April 11, 1977

Component: Foreword

Comments: None

Component: 2, Comparison of Program Output with Community Occupational Needs

Comments: In dealing with the survey of community needs and student interests, you may also want to survey training capabilities of both the public and private sectors.

Change the sample cover letter; make it more personal.

Modify the sample employment opportunities survey (Appendix A) and program enrollment summary (Appendix E).

Component: 6, Evaluation of Occupational Competencies

Comments: Modify the paragraph, "Writing Job Descriptions." These are all conditions, not descriptions.

APPENDIX D-3

FIELD READING COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Bascom Mahaffey, Principal, Gadsden Vocational School
William Spear, Director, Vocational Education
Reviewing Institution: Gadsden County
Date of Review: April 1, 1977

Component: Foreword

Comments: The division and organization of study (evaluation) areas were good.

Answered in the affirmative to Suggested Review Guidelines.

Component: 3, Assessing Student Career Interests

Comments: The information is good, easy to follow, and could be real useful. I would call on the Director of Guidance and Testing in this district for help.

APPENDIX D-4

FIELD READING COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Steve Foland, Director, Vocational and Adult Education
Reviewing Institution: Jefferson County Schools, Monticello
Date of Review: March 28 - April 4, 1977

Component: Foreword

Comments: Well done. Easy to read and understand.

Component: 2, Comparison of Program Output with Community Occupational Needs

Comments: The method outlined for conducting a survey to compare program output with labor market demand is good and very clear, but it has been historically inaccurate, costly and complicated. I'm wondering how purposeful or accurate it will be.

Component: 6, Evaluation of Occupational Competencies

Comments: I specifically like the utilization of advisory committees and actual employers providing input about competence of graduates.

General Comments: Instruments suggested are adequate and could be used or adapted for local use with ease.

APPENDIX D-5

FIELD READING COMMENTS

Reviewed by: William R. McMillan, Day Principal
George Walker, Instructor
Barbara Stanford, Instructur
Joan Gill, Instructor

Reviewing Institution: Suwanee-Hamilton Area Vocational-Technical Center, Live Oak

Date of Review: April 21, 1977

Component: Foreword

Comments: None

Component: 2, Comparison of Program Output

Comments: Page 2, Line 3. Is this local, district, state, or national labor market needs? Why can't the Regional Planning Districts be the same on the Florida map as the Vocational Council Districts, page 9A.

Component: 8, Assess Local Budget Policy

Comments: For purposes of calculating the current operating program consider, "if a student is sick or hospitalized."

General Comments: May I suggest a field or pilot program for the evaluation project to get a better feel for its compatibility with vocational centers. The two sections that were reviewed are great, but if the 15 sections are about the same physical size, will the vocational center be able to devote the amount of time necessary to do a thorough evaluation?

APPENDIX D-6

FIELD READING COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Robert Greener, Director, Vocational Education
Reviewing Institution: Wakulla County, Medart
Date of Review: April 20, 1977

Component: Foreword

Comments: It does a very good job of introducing the idea of data-based evaluation as well as carrying the reader into it.

Component: 1, Organizing for Data-Based Locally Directed Evaluation (DBLDE)

Comments: The initial approach is excellent. It offers Wakulla County a step-by-step procedure to follow. If the remainder of this component is written in this vein, any LEA will be able to organize for data-based locally directed evaluation.

Component: 5, Analysis of the Utilization of Community Resources

Comments: This does a good job in outlining steps of procedure. I visualize that the component was, in essence, an evaluation instrument. The approach better meets the needs of Wakulla County. These procedures will give Wakulla the guidance necessary to develop an evaluation unique to our needs. Overall, the component is very good. I am favorably impressed.

Criticism: How much of a threat will teachers feel from this component? If the evaluation reveals that the teacher is not using resources, the teacher might view this as threatening, especially if they feel somewhat insecure in their job.

APPENDIX D-7

General Comments: The package looks real good. It will fill the gap between where most LEAs are and what the state is doing in program review.

It is a bit philosophical in places. It assumes that all people are doing their job and are interested in improving vocational education. If this assumption were true, there would not be a mandate from the people for accountability in education.

Under the concept the evaluation could be spread over a full year, looking at all aspects of the program. When this approach is used, teachers will tend to accept and maybe even look forward to local evaluation.

APPENDIX D-8

FIELD READING COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Fred L. Howell, Dean, Vocational and Technical Education
Reviewing Institution: Chipola Junior College, Marianna
Reviewed by: Thomas L. Melvin, Director, Vocational Education
Reviewing Institution: Jackson County Schools, Marianna
Date of Review: April 25-26, 1977

Component: Foreword (Melvin and Howell)

Component: 6, Evaluation of Occupational Competencies (Melvin)

Component: 7, Evaluation of Instructional Personnel (Melvin and Howell)

Component: 8, Assessment of Local Budget Policy for Support of Vocational Instructional Programs (Howell)

Comments: Melvin: The materials look good. I am pleased with what I read.

Howell: I like the ideas as presented verbally. Local self-evaluation concept is good and should prove successful.

APPENDIX D-9

FIELD READING COMMENTS

Reviewed by: John C. Davis, Sr., Coordinator, Technical (Industrial) Education Instructors in Cosmetology, Masonry, Welding and Auto Body
Reviewing Institution: Lake City Community College, Lake City
Date of Review: April 21, 1977

Component: 3, Assessing Student Career Interest

Comments: None

Component: 8, Assessment of Local Budget Policy for Support of Vocational Instructional Programs

Comments: Include the funding formula in the package. We need to know the funding categories and funding formula to derive the FTE.

General Comments: The packages are well designed and will do the job for which they are intended.

APPENDIX D-10

FIELD READING COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Lewis M. Tucker, Director,
Occupational and Adult Education
Reviewing Institution: North Florida Junior College, Madison
Date of Review: April 19, 1977

Component: Foreword

Comments: Page 4, Local occupational needs should not be the only criteria used for determining program to be offered. Employability of youth who will leave the community should be considered.

Component: 4, Facilities and Equipment Evaluation

Comments: The document seems well-planned and covers facilities and equipment evaluation very efficiently.

Component: 6, Evaluation of Occupational Competency

Comments: It seems to me that competency-based materials already developed by counties and instructors should be made available statewide to avoid wasted effort "inventing the wheel" a thousand times. Much of the detail for developing a curriculum and the management of the program are already done in the V-TECS catalogs. I feel that if the instructor spends time to maintain all of the paper work indicated in this component, he will have no time to do careful supervision and demonstrations for each student. Much useful instruction is done on a one-to-one basis and provides hands-on experience.

General Comments: All three documents are well formulated and will serve a very useful and constructive purpose. It is an important document which can contribute materially to the improvement of vocational education in Florida.

APPENDIX D-11

FIELD READING COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Lawrence Taylor, Principal, Vocational Education
Reviewing Institution: Dozier School for Boys, Marianna
Date of Review: April 1, 1977

Component: Foreword

Comments: None.

Component: 4, Facilities and Equipment Evaluation

Comments: This component seems to imply that good equipment is needed for a successful program. However, I have seen good instruction produce outstanding results with poor or no equipment.

Component: 7, Evaluation of Instructional Personnel

Comments: The comment that the self-evaluation of instructor's form (instrument) becomes the property of the instructor upon completion, may be taken literally by some of my instructors. Thus, no change would result as they would file it away and not share it with anyone.

General Comments: I needed the component on Evaluation of Instructional Personnel last week. I made up my own evaluation forms. The components appear to be useful, easy to understand and could be implemented in their present form.

APPENDIX E

FIELD TESTING COMMENTS

Reviewer: Mr. Steve Foland
Reviewing Institution: Jefferson County Vocational School
Date of Review: April 2 and May 6, 1977

Component #2: Comparison of Program Output with Community Occupational Need

Comments: Initial contact was made with Mr. Foland, Director of Vocational Education for Jefferson County, April 26, 1977. At this meeting it was decided to evaluate the Auto Mechanics Program. Additionally, the total district was defined as the community for which program output supplied auto mechanics. For purposes of this evaluation, the evaluation team was defined as Mr. Foland, Mr. Britt, the auto mechanics instructor, and Mr. Bill Stancil, project staff member at Florida State University. Mr. Foland agreed to pull follow-up information from his files to have output data ready for the second meeting. The project staff member agreed to pull Occupational Information and Delivery System (OIDS) data together as the described primary method of determining labor market demand. (It was felt by the team that the survey [alternative] method would be too time-consuming to finish before the end of the school year.)

At the second meeting on May 6, 1977, the team used the instrumentation provided in the component to conduct a discrepancy analysis. Mr. Britt and Mr. Foland had chosen the last graduating class (1975-1976) for which computer follow-up data was available, to compare output with need. While the data did not show place of employment, Mr. Britt had this information available in his files. Of five graduates, four were placed and currently working in field. The fifth graduate was working but not in the field for which trained. OIDS data for Jefferson County indicated that program output should be only 1.4 graduates per year to meet district demands; obviously a discrepancy existed. The question was then raised as to whether OIDS data is applicable to a small district as no problems exist with current placement or program graduates. The team recommended that a local survey to determine need may be the best approach for small districts when comparing program output with occupational needs as prescribed in this evaluation. The instrumentation provided in the component appeared to be satisfactory. However, it was recommended that Appendix E of the component be modified to indicate the year for which program graduates were chosen for the evaluation.

APPENDIX E-2

Reviewer: Mr. Thomas L. Melvin
Reviewing Institution: Marianna High School
Date of Review: April 25 to May 25, 1977

Component #3: Assessing Student Career Interests

Comments: On April 25, a member of the project staff met with Mt. Melvin, Director of Vocational Education, Jackson County; Mrs. Bryant, Guidance Counselor, Marianna High School; Mrs. Thomas Melvin, Occupational Specialist, Marianna High School; and Mr. Tim Chase, Career Education Coordinator, Jackson County. An introduction to the concept of the evaluation project was given and the participation of the Jackson County system in the field test of one component was requested. It was decided that the California Occupational Preference Survey (COPS) results and the Thomas Career Interest Inventory (CII) would be used in conjunction with the activities of this field test.

On May 2, thirty copies of the CII were mailed to the field test site, along with a cover sheet requesting additional student information.

On May 18, the CII and other materials were received. The CII was scored and the results were summarized.

On May 25, the project staff representatives reported a summary of the findings to the Jackson County personnel.

Summary: The students involved in this field test were randomly selected from six vocational courses representative of the program areas of agriculture, business, and home economics. The COPS had already been administered to the students at an earlier time. This instrument provides a profile in percentiles in 14 areas, for example, Skilled - Service; Professional - Service; Skilled - Linguistic; and Professional - Linguistic. Within each of these 14 areas, occupational titles which are related are listed.

The CII was administered to five students from each of the six selected vocational courses. A cover sheet which accompanied the CII requested the following information on the participating students: Course in which the student is presently enrolled; the student's future plans for taking vocational education courses; student occupational goals. In addition, the guidance personnel were asked to list on each student's data sheet those areas on the COPS where the the student's measured interests were in the 50th percentile

or above. It was requested that these areas be listed in descending order by percentile, for example, 99th percentile, first; 98th percentile, second, and so on.

After administering and scoring the CII, data from each student was compared to determine the existence or nonexistence of a discrepancy among the student's goals, his interests as shown on the COPS and the CII, his present enrollment, and his planned future enrollment, if provided. Figure 1 from the Component package was used to summarize the data on each student. The project staff determined that an additional form was necessary to present the racap of the findings of this field test. This form was designed to present the results by categories of program areas, present and future enrollments, and by areas in which discrepancies exist.

Findings: There are 17 of 30 students who participated in this field test with whom the guidance personnel should not be concerned. The reason is the students' goals, interests, and present enrollment were "matched." The remaining 13 students should be interviewed by the guidance personnel. An analysis of these 13 students' goals, measured interests on the COPS and CII, and enrollment in vocational programs revealed discrepancies. For example, one student "matched" on his goal and enrollment, but "missed" with regard to his interests and enrollment. Another student declared no goal and "missed" with regard to his interests and his enrollment. The summary findings for each student and the recap sheet are attached to this report.

LEA Reactions:

1. Materials in this package will certainly help the smaller schools and small school districts determine the occupational needs of their students and identify those students who may need additional occupational counseling.

2. The procedures were compatible with the local system's operating procedures.

3. Some students with no occupational goals were identified. This will help the guidance personnel in providing some direction for students in their course planning.

APPENDIX E-4

Reviewer: Mr. Larry Taylor
Reviewing Institution: Dozier School for Boys, Marianna
Date of Review: April 18, 1977

Component #4: Facilities and Equipment Evaluation

Comments: The limited field test of this component was conducted by Mr. Berlin Carroll and Mr. Ray Boyett, project Staff, in cooperation with Mr. Larry Taylor, Vocational Principal, and Mr. Graham, Instructor of Small Engines. Approximately two hours were spent in planning for the limited field test. Mr. Taylor supplied the group with the objectives of the program which were then reviewed by the group. Mr. Carroll, Mr. Boyett, and Mr. Graham considered themselves as the LDE team, and proceeded to examine the facilities and equipment evaluation package for its utility. The evaluation instruments were reviewed for their appropriateness and specific items on the instruments were identified which required deleting or modifying. Appendix A of the package was used by Mr. Taylor to identify items which should be included in the evaluation.

After the planning phase had been completed, Mr. Graham was contacted and a visual inspection was made of the small engine shop and its associated instructional facilities Appendix B was used as a checklist as the evaluation proceeded. Measurements were made and noted of the square footage for the classroom, laboratory, and storage areas. Electrical and mechanical safety was observed on specific items of equipment as well as the traffic safety for entrances and exits.

When the physical inspection had been completed, the team conducted an exit interview, and tested the remaining instrumentation to determine its utility. The latest inventory of tools and equipment was compared against the state recommended items, and the program space (square footage) was compared with the state recommended space which should be allocated to a small engine instructional program. Discrepancies were identified and recorded on the appropriate component instruments.

Upon completion of the limited field test, Mr. Taylor suggested that the exercise had been very beneficial. He also expressed the belief that DBLDE procedures developed by an external group, that is a group outside the Department

of Health and Rehabilitative Services or HRS, would be considered seriously by HRS. Mr. Taylor felt that the greatest benefit from DBLDE was to identify existing discrepancies for the purpose of justifying facilities and equipment needed to satisfy the objectives of Dozier's programs.

APPENDIX E-6

Reviewers: Dr. Milton Acton, Mr. William Kirby, and Mr. William Slocumb
Reviewing Institution: Tom P. Haney Vocational-Technical Center, Panama City
Date of Review: May 23, 1977

Component #5: Analysis of Utilization of Community Resources

Comments: A preliminary meeting with Dr. Milton Acton, Superintendent, Bay County, and Mr. William Kirby, Director, Vocational Education, at the Superintendent's office provided the necessary permission to conduct the field test. It was decided as a result of this meeting that the Auto Mechanics Program at Haney Vocational-Technical Center, Panama City, would provide the target program for the limited field test.

Through the cooperation of Mr. William Slocumb, Haney's Principal, and Mr. Threadwell Campbell, Auto Mechanics Instructor, the limited field test was conducted June 2, 1977. Mr. Slocumb provided both encouragement and a more than adequate office with telephones for the project staff to use in conducting a limited survey through telephone interviews. Mr. Campbell provided the program objectives and the list of community resources currently being used in this projgram for meeting those objectives. Two members from the project staff, Mrs. Mary Haskins and Mr. William Stancil, worked with Mr. Campbell as the LDE team to test the procedures within the component and to collect the data as well as analyze the usefulness of the instrumentation.

Using a five-year plan for the auto mechanics program, the team listed unit objectives for community resources assessment. The project staff then formulated questions to determine the resources currently being used. Through the cooperation of an active craft advisory committee, more than 25 automobile dealerships, parts houses, wrecking yards, and service stations are currently providing community resources to strengthen the auto mechanics program. These resources ranged from providing actual equipment for use within the classroom. Other resources included charts, films, film strips, transparencies, cut-away demonstration models, factory representative personnel as guest speakers, and machine shop visitation for observation of crankshaft grinding, etc. These resources, other than guest speakers. and visitation sites, had been donated to the school for permanent use. As new needs arise, the craft committee provides either equipment or access to equipment to meet those needs.

APPENDIX E-7

A tour of the auto mechanics working space revealed that modern, up-do-date equipment was available for every instructional area. Therefore, the need for community resources to meet the program objectives was very limited when coupled with existing usage and the available equipment. However, it was determined that a need existed for either charts or a cutaway model to show the working principles of rotary engines. Using the suggested techniques within the component, a personal interview was conducted to collect the resource data. Working through the parts manager of Mazda (rotary engine) dealership, it was determined that the factory representative who visits Panama City on a recurring basis could provide the resource to meet this need. Similar procedures were used to determine suggested solutions to two additional minor deficiencies that were revealed during the discrepancy analysis.

For the purposes of the limited field test, many of the instruments provided within the component were not used. However, if several programs were to be analyzed within the same time frame, it would be beneficial to have the additional instrumentation. One minor problem developed when listing program objectives. The question was raised as to which objectives should be used for the analysis, the unit objectives or the specific task objectives? For purposes of this limited field test it was decided to use the broad objectives. Other than this minor problem, it was determined that the component and its existing instrumentation was useful in its present form.

APPENDIX E-8

Reviewer: Mr. Lewis Tucker
Reviewing Institution: North Florida Junior College, Madison
Date of Review: April 27, 1977

Component #6: Evaluation of Occupational Competence

Comments: Project staff members, Mr. Ray Boyett and Mrs. Mary Haskins, met with Mr. Lewis Tucker, Director of Occupational and Adult Education, to plan for field testing this component. Mr. Tucker suggested and all agreed that the masonry instructor would use the component to evaluate the competence of a sample of students in the masonry program. The field test was completed, and the performance rating sheets for three students were returned to the project staff on May 6, 1977. The procedures outlined in this component were easily followed and the sample forms provided were considered appropriate for this activity. The instructor who used the procedures offered no suggestion for revising the component.

Mr. Tucker commented that the evaluation instruments seemed very easy to understand and they were designed to obtain the desired information. After learning the design, "The instruments were very workable and easy to administer," according to Mr. Tucker.

APPENDIX E-9

Reviewer: Mr. Bascom Mahaffey
Reviewing Institution: Gadsden Vocational School, Quincy
Dates of Review: May 4 - 9, 1977

Component #7: Evaluation of Instructional Personnel

Comments: Two representatives from the project staff, Mr. Berlin R. Carroll and Miss Ermine M. Owenby, met with Mr. Bascom Mahaffey, Vocational Principal, on April 26, to discuss plans for conducting a limited field test of this component. He arranged for a meeting with the participating teachers and representatives from the project staff. During this meeting, the activities involved in assessing instructional personnel were explained and discussed. The group agreed upon a target teacher, Mr. Lanny Bishop, and the peers who would participate in the exercise. The target teacher would establish his rating for an "ideal" instructor, conduct a self-evaluation, and collect assessment data from one group of students by using the sample instruments contained in the component. The peer teachers were to be provided released time to observe the target teacher and were to complete the sample assessment form. Mr. Mahaffey was to evaluate the target teacher, also, using the sample form. A tentative exit conference date was established so that the project staff could return to the site, review the findings, and receive the comments on the procedures for conducting this evaluation.

During the exit conference, all the individuals involved in the field test openly and candidly discussed the merits of the activity. All agreed that the assessment of instruction is desirable and essential to the improvement of instruction. There was concern expressed about several points.

(1) The target teacher expressed the opinion that (a) peer evaluation should be voluntary; (b) program review self-study standards could be effectively used to evaluate one's program; and (c) student assessment of instruction forms, if they are to be used, should be rewritten on the students' reading level.

(2) The peer teachers expressed their concern for peer assessment through the following comments and questions:

"How does a peer know if the instructor being observed has developed long- or short-range objectives for a course?"

"Day-to-day and hour-by-hour lesson plans are unrealistic."

"Sometimes a 15-ring circus exists in the classroom or shop, but a great deal of learning is going on. This may be interpreted as being chaos rater than a learning situation."

"An instructor may have but one opportunity during the school year to 'pull' a transmission. When this occurs, you push all other plans aside to teach transmission repair."

"Peer evaluation is difficult. What if you don't like the teacher you are evaluating? What if you like him personally, but he is a lousy teacher?"

"The use of peer evaluation may create internal friction."

"The time involved in conducting such an evaluation detracts from instruction to the students, which is the prime reason 'we' exist."

"Peer evaluation should be conducted by individuals knowledgeable in the subject area. There could be problems with persons from the academic area evaluating a non-academically trained vocational teacher."

Mr. Mahaffey expressed the opinion that "pre-program review clinics" such as that recently conducted in Dade County, prior to the program review by the DOE, might provide the insights necessary for receiving a favorable program review. He suggested that the Likert-type scales used with the instruments in this component might be eliminated and a scale that reads "no improvement needed," "improvement needed," and "not observed" be used in lieu of the Likert approach. However, he did agree that supervisory assessment, as outlined in the component, could be used to satisfy the annual evaluation requirements.

APPENDIX E-11

Reviewer: Dr. John C. Davis, Sr. and five supervisors of industrial programs
Reviewing Institution: Lake City Community College, Lake City
Date of Review: May 6, 1977

Component #8: Assessment of Local Budget Policy for Support of Vocational Instructional Programs

Comments: Two members of the project staff met with Dr. John C. Davis, Coordinator of Technical (Industrial) Education, and five Lake City Community College supervisors of industrial programs to field test the component. The evaluation team decided to evaluate the welding program for the 1975-1976 school year. Using the detailed task breakdown, the budget analysis worksheet (appendix C) and the discrepancy analysis worksheet (Appendix D), a step-by-step analysis was begun.

Early in the process it was discovered that the information provided for calculating FEFP funds generated did not apply to community colleges. Also, it was found that the method for determining FTE in community colleges differed from that of the secondary schools and the post-secondary area vocational schools. Thus, the procedures provided within the component had to be altered to meet the local situation.

Using the altered procedures, total funds generated within the welding program were computed and placed on the discrepancy analysis worksheet Following this activity, program direct costs were calculated and placed on the budget analysis worksheet. No problems were encountered in this process. However, when the program pro rata share of indirect cost calculation process began, it was discovered that the local evaluation team must have input from the business office to complete this section. Thus, it was recommended that the local education agencies include someone from the finance section or local business office as a part of the evaluation team.

From the procedures to this point, it was evident that a discrepancy existed as total program/course cost had already exceeded total funds generated within the welding program. The instrumentation provided within this component was adequate but the task breakdown procedures required modification and alteration to meet community college requirements.

APPENDIX F

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF JACKSON COUNTY
Phone (904) 482-7494
P O BOX 809
MARIANNA, FLORIDA 32446

ROBERT E. CHILDS
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

May 9, 1977

Mr. Berlin R. Carroll
Coordinator, DBLDE Project
Vocational Education Tract
Florida State University
202 South Woodward
Tallahassee, FL 32306

Dear Mr. Carroll:

I commend you and the staff on the great job you are doing with Phase I of DBLDE. In looking over the components that have been developed to date, I am really impressed. This looks like the document we in vocational education have been needing to put it all together for understanding and use by administrators, instructors, students and public representatives. The use of the guidelines, instruments and procedures will identify the problems and suggest corrective action.

Please continue with your development of Phase II. We need it in order to do a complete job.

If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Thomas L. Melvin
Director of Vocational Education

TLM:co

APPENDIX F-2

NORTH FLORIDA JUNIOR COLLEGE

MADISON, FLORIDA 32340

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
OCCUPATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

May 13, 1977

Dr. Hollie B. Thomas, Director
Data Based-Locally Directed Evaulation Project
202 S. Woodward St.
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Dear Dr. Thomas:

I appreciate the opportunity of participating in a field study of the Data Based-Locally Directed Evaulation instrument. I enjoyed making a study of the two components which were assigned to me. I feel that when the instrument is throughly tested and put into use it will have definite value as a guide for teachers, supervisors and administrators in providing responsible vocational education. Since accountability is now a fact of life in Florida vocational education, I feel that this instrument will be very helpful to local instructors and administrative personnel as well as to state staff who will be evaluating vocational programs.

I congratulate those who have participated in the preparation of this instrument. I view it as a very worthwhile instrument and feel that it is workable, easy to understand and that the data secured in use of this instrument will be sound.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity of participating in the field study.

Sincerely,

Lewis M. Tucker

Lewis M. Tucker, Director
Occupational and Adult Education

LMT:csb

cc: Dr. Roy Giehls, Jr.
Mr. Ray Boyett